


## EXHIBIT B



Page 1

Westlaw.

Not Reported in F.Supp.

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1998 WL 42252  
**(Cite as: Not Reported in F.Supp.)**

C

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1998 WL 42252  
 Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, E.D.  
 Pennsylvania.

In the Matter of the Application of  
 Bloomberg L.P. and Michael Sherman to  
 Quash Subpoena

In re VMARK SOFTWARE, INC.  
 Securities Litigation  
**No. CIV. A. 97-227.**

Jan. 8, 1998.

Abbe F. Fletman , Klehr, Harrison,  
 Harvey, Branzburg & Ellers, Phila, PA, for  
 In the Matter of the Application of  
 Bloomberg L.P. and Michael Sherman to  
 Quash Subpoena.

Ira Neil Richards , Trujillo Rodriguez &  
 Richards, LLC, Phila, PA, for In re Vmark  
 Software, Inc. Securities Litigation.

#### MEMORANDUM-ORDER

GREEN, S.J.

\*1 Presently pending is the Motion of  
 Bloomberg L.P. and Michael Sherman to  
 Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum pursuant to  
 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 45  
 , and Plaintiffs' Response thereto. For the  
 reasons set forth below, the motion will be  
 denied in part and granted in part.

#### Factual Background

Plaintiffs are a class of purchasers of  
 Vmark Software, Inc. ("Vmark")  
 securities. Michael Sherman is a former  
 reporter for Bloomberg Business News ("  
 Bloomberg"). In July, 1995, Sherman  
 interviewed James K. Walsh, a defendant  
 in the underlying securities fraud lawsuit  
 and the Chief Financial Officer of Vmark  
 at that time. Thereafter, Sherman wrote a  
 news article allegedly based upon the  
 interview with Mr. Walsh. Plaintiffs  
 allege that Walsh made false and  
 misleading statements in the news article,  
 regarding specific projections for Vmark's  
 1995 third quarter. Plaintiffs seek to  
 depose Sherman, for the purpose of  
 authenticating the article and the  
 statements therein. In their subpoena,  
 Plaintiffs also seek from Sherman, all  
 documents pertaining to Vmark, including  
 but not limited to the news article in issue.

Bloomberg and Sherman, non-parties to  
 the Vmark Class Action, seek to quash the  
 subpoena, on the ground that Sherman has  
 a privilege against revealing his  
 confidential sources and verifying the  
 accuracy of quotes in his article.  
 Bloomberg has offered to provide an  
 affidavit from Sherman in lieu of the  
 deposition. However, Plaintiffs argue that  
 while the affidavit will be admissible  
 evidence in a motion for summary

© 2005 Thomson/West. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works.

Not Reported in F.Supp.

Page 2

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1998 WL 42252  
(Cite as: Not Reported in F.Supp.)

judgment, the article itself and Walsh's statements, when offered for the truth, will be inadmissible hearsay at trial. Hence, Plaintiffs argue, their entire claim may fail without the deposition of Sherman authenticating his article and the statements therein.

#### Discussion

The Federal common law of privilege governs in an action where, as here, plaintiffs assert only federal claims. Fed.R.Evid. 501. Under federal common law, journalists enjoy a qualified, but not absolute, privilege with respect to information gathered in connection with the publication of articles. *Branzburg v. Hayes*, 408 U.S. 665, 92 S.Ct. 2646, 33 L.Ed.2d 626 (1972).

In *Riley v. City of Chester*, 612 F.2d 708, 715 (3d Cir.1979), the Third Circuit held that journalists have a qualified federal common law privilege to protect confidential sources arising under Federal Rule of Evidence 501. The court cautioned, however, that this privilege is not absolute and must be weighed against the strong interest of litigants in the full and complete disclosure of relevant evidence. *Id.* at 716. Indeed, evidentiary privileges are generally disfavored because they interfere with the search for truth. *United States v. Criden*, 633 F.2d 346, 357 (3d Cir.1980), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 1113, 101 S.Ct. 924, 66 L.Ed.2d 842 (1981). Consequently, the court must "balance on

one hand the policies which give rise to the privilege and their applicability to the facts at hand against the need for the evidence sought to be obtained." *Riley*, 612 F.2d at 716. In striking this balance, therefore, the court must engage in a very fact specific inquiry. *Id.*

\*2 To aid in this determination, the Third Circuit, in *Riley* has articulated a three part test which a movant must satisfy in order to overcome a reporter's qualified privilege. The test as restated in *Criden*, requires:

First, the movant must demonstrate that he has made an effort to obtain the information from other sources. Second, he must demonstrate that the only access to the information is through the journalist and her sources. Finally, the movant must persuade the court that the information sought is crucial to the claim.

*Criden*, 633 F.2d at 358. Here, Plaintiffs seek to compel Sherman's testimony with respect to statements attributed to defendant Walsh in Sherman's published article. These statements are among those that the Plaintiffs allege are false or misleading, and upon which they predicate their securities fraud claim. Plaintiffs attempted to elicit this information directly from Walsh through deposition. In deposition testimony however, Walsh stated that he does not recall whether or not he made the statements. Furthermore, the record is silent as to whether Walsh made any similar statements to others regarding earning expectations for Vmark.

Not Reported in F.Supp.

Page 3

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1998 WL 42252  
(Cite as: Not Reported in F.Supp.)

Accordingly, since Walsh is unable to verify the statements at issue, and since the record does not disclose any other source for this information apart from Sherman, I conclude that Plaintiffs have met the first prong of the *Riley* test.

As to the second prong, I conclude that the only access to this information is through Sherman. Sherman is the only person qualified to testify as to his reportorial practices with respect to the statements of others. Bloomberg argues that since newspaper articles are self-authenticating under Federal Rule of Evidence 902(6), Sherman's deposition testimony is unnecessary to authenticate his article. While it is true that newspaper articles do not require extrinsic evidence of authenticity prior to admissibility, there may still remain the questions of authority and responsibility for statements contained therein. *See*, Fed.R.Evid. 902(6) Advisory Committee's Note. Here, Sherman is the only other person, apart from Walsh, who can verify the statements he attributed to Walsh. Bloomberg claims that Sherman has no independent recollection of the interview and that he does not possess any reporter's notes that would verify the statements contained in the news article. Even if Sherman does not recall the interview, however, he can still testify as to his general newsgathering practices, including whether he typically reports interviewees' statements verbatim. Moreover, his deposition testimony, as to his lack of recollection, may provide evidence to support the admissibility of

the contents of the news article.

Finally, I conclude that Sherman's testimony is crucial to the maintenance of Plaintiffs' securities fraud claim based on Walsh's statements, as quoted in, and disseminated to the market, by the article. Plaintiffs allege that Walsh made specific statements regarding Vmark's earnings and revenues for its 1995 fiscal third quarter. Walsh claims that he does not recall making those statements. The deposition testimony of Sherman may produce evidence that is crucial to the Plaintiffs' case.

\*3 Bloomberg contends that the affidavit offered by Sherman should be sufficient to satisfy Plaintiffs' needs in this matter. Affidavits and depositions are generally admissible in summary judgment proceedings, Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c), (e). However, declarations contained in affidavits are hearsay, and unless they fit within an appropriate exception to the hearsay rule, are generally barred at trial. Moreover, on this record, it does not appear that the affidavit is admissible under the provisions of the catch-all exceptions to the hearsay rule.

Accordingly, since Plaintiffs have satisfied the three part test of *Riley*, the motion for a protective order to quash, will be denied with respect to Sherman's deposition and any documents pertaining to the published July, 1995 article. In their subpoena, Plaintiffs also seek for inspection and copying, "all documents [in Sherman's

Not Reported in F.Supp.

Page 4

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1998 WL 42252  
(Cite as: Not Reported in F.Supp.)

possession] concerning Vmark, including but not limited to [the] news article published on July 11, 1995." Plaintiffs, however, have not provided any justification, under *Riley*, for such a blanket request. Accordingly, the motion will be granted insofar as Plaintiffs seek to subpoena any documents pertaining to Vmark that are unrelated to the July, 1995 article. An appropriate order follows.

#### ORDER

AND NOW, this 8th day of January, 1998, upon consideration of the Motion of Bloomberg L.P. and Michael Sherman to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 45, and the Plaintiffs' Response thereto, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is DENIED as to Sherman's Deposition Testimony and any documents regarding the July, 1995 news article. The motion is GRANTED as to Sherman's Production of any other documents unrelated to the July, 1995 news article.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Michael Sherman shall appear for a deposition in this matter at a time and place mutually convenient to the parties before January 16, 1998.

E.D.Pa., 1998.

Application of Bloomberg

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1998 WL 42252

END OF DOCUMENT

© 2005 Thomson/West. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works.

Westlaw.

Date of Printing: JUN 21.2005

**KEYCITE**

**Application of Bloomberg, 1998 WL 42252 (E.D.Pa., Jan 08, 1998) (NO. CIV. A. 97-227)**

**History**

- => 1 **Application of Bloomberg, 1998 WL 42252 (E.D.Pa. Jan 08, 1998) (NO. CIV. A. 97-227)**

© Copyright 2005 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, A  
058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.